DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 324 UD 011 402

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Gordon, Edmund W., Ed. |
| TITLE | Access and Appraisal: Continuing Education, Higher Education, Career Entry. The Report of the Commission on Tests to the College Entrance Examination Board. |
| INSTITUTION | Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | Nov 70 |
| NOTE | 12p.; IRCD Bulletin, v6 n4 Nov. 1970 |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *College Entrance Examinations, Comparative Testing, Educational Change, Educational Objectives, Educational Testing, *Equal Education, Higher Education, *Post Secondary Education, Predictive Ability (Testing), *Relevance (Education), Standardized Tests, *Student School Relationship, Student Testing, Testing Problems, Testing Programs, Test Interpretation |

ABSTRACT

This issue of the IRCD Bulletin comprises Part I of the Report of the Commission on Tests of the College Entrance Examination Board, and a review of the recommendations made by the Commission. The Commission addressed itself to the question, "What can schools do to increase the readiness of students for further education, and what can colleges do to prepare to receive and deal with the kinds of students they are going to receive?" Examining criticisms of current tests and their use, the Commission concluded that the College Board should continue its testing functions in American education. However, considerable modification and improvement are needed if the tests and services are to support equitable and efficient access to the system of mass postsecondary education. Tests and services should serve three functions: (1) "distributive," or providing comprehensive and reciprocal descriptions of both students and college programs; (2) "credentialing," or certifying demonstrable educational attainment regardless of college attendance; and, (3) "educative," or instructing students in both subject-matter areas and decision-making. Specific recommendations for these changes are included. (Author/DM)

# IRCD BULLETIN

PUBLICATION OF THE ERIC INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER ON THE DISADVANTAGED

Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute • Teachers College • Columbia University
525 West 120 Street, N. Y., N. Y. 10027



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY



ED049324

Volume VI, No. 4 November 1970


# ACCESS AND APPRAISAL: CONTINUING EDUCATION, HIGHER EDUCATION, CAREER ENTRY

## The Report of the Commission on Tests to the College Entrance Examination Board

## RIGHTING THE BALANCE: A SECOND LOOK BY THE CHAIRMAN, AT THE REPORT OF COMMISSION ON TESTS, COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD*


David V. Tiedeman


### The Enemy is Partially Us

I am honored that you of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools direct your attention so quickly to the only recently published report of the Commission on Tests, College Entrance Examination Board. The traditional relationship of secondary school and college characterized by the support of education in New England has principally defined the purposes of the College Board for the first 70 of its years. In this regard, your pattern has diffused across the nation with the assistance of the Board and you have thereby been able to share the good which is in your pattern with all in the United States.

However, I commend the courage of your officers and staff in directing the collective attention of us in attendance at this the Eighty-fifth Annual Meeting of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools to the theme: "Rethinking School and College Relationships." Four years ago the Officers and Trustees of the College Board also put 21 of us to work, through a Commission on Tests, to consider the testing function implications of the query associated with your theme; namely "what can schools do to increase the readiness of students for further education and what can colleges do to prepare to receive and deal with the kinds of students they are going to receive" (Program, p. 3). Your query in your theme puts the dilemma of today's student squarely in front of you; namely, changing *ourselves* and


*(Continued on page 2)*


UD011402

* Address of the 85th Annual Meeting, New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Boston, Massachusetts, December 4, 1970 (Revised slightly on 12/5/70).


**DAVID V. TIEDEMAN** is a Professor of Education at the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University.


## RIGHTING THE BALANCE: SUMMARY OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON TESTS


Copyright © 1970 College Entrance Examination Board
Reprinted from Report of the Commission on Tests, I. Righting the Balance by permission of the College Entrance Examination Board.


The Commission on Tests was charged with undertaking a thorough and critical review of the College Entrance Examination Board's testing functions in American education, with considering possibilities for fundamental changes in the present tests and their use, and with making recommendations based on its conclusions.

After reviewing criticisms of current tests and their use, the Commission was convinced that the College Board should continue, rather than abandon, its testing functions in American education. The Commission concluded, however, that the Board's current tests and associated services are in need of considerable modification and improvement if they are to support equitable and efficient access to America's emerging system of mass postsecondary education.

The Commission also concluded that the College Board's tests and associated services—although both would need adjustment and augmentation to hew closer to the public interest in doing so—could and should serve three functions in American education:

1. A "distributive" function by contributing to comprehensive and sensitive descriptions of students, of colleges and their programs, and of the potential relationships between the two as both students and colleges engage in a process of reciprocal choice.
2. A "credentialing" function by certifying demonstrable educational attainment whether acquired by attendance in school or college or not.
3. An "educative" function by instructing students both in subject-matter areas and in the skills and methods of making decisions and choosing.

The Commission recommended that the schools and colleges that in association are the College Entrance Examination Board cause the Board to adopt the full range of potential entrants to programs offering opportunities for postsecondary education as a clientele that is as valued as the Board's institutional clientele and thus is due as large a share of service.

The Commission generated suggestions about the implications, in a system of mass postsecondary education, of the Board's acting for both its traditional institutional clientele and an equally valued student clientele.


*(Continued on page 9)*

(Continued from page 1)

*our* procedures so that the help we offer others through education may be of truer service. The fact of the matter is that we as well as students, must change in this process. This fact is hard to admit and to act upon. Nevertheless, it is the cold hard cause of the present state of the now only bouncing development of our civilization.

The Officers and Trustees of the College Board had some inkling of this need within the Board itself when they established the Commission on Tests in 1966. As I shall note today, the Board's Trustees invited a Commission to weigh the implications and possibilities for the Board's change in light of the fact that the Board is both a part of civilization's present inability to change itself and capable of important action in moving to solution of that dilemma. I hope that I can today recapture, in shorter order than does the Commission's Report, the way in which we made that argument to the College Board so that I may take advantage of our being together; first, to enlist your understanding that the change must occur, and then to leave you in a condition, as we separate, of soon attempting your necessary share in meeting the needs of that change.

## The Commission and Its Reports

Although I, as chairman of the Board's former Commission on Tests, have the opportunity to review that report for you, I would be less the person I am if I didn't initially admit that I speak for 20 good colleagues and true as well for myself. In the course of the Commission's work I had opportunity to experience the friendship and minds of 20 wonderful men and women. These people who were B. Alden Thresher as my vice chairman, and Philip Abelson, Clyde Blocker, John Carroll, James Coleman, Robert Cross, Margery Foster, Edgar Friedenberg, Edmund Gordon, Fred Hechinger, John Hersey, Wayne Holtzman, John Hoy, Sidney Marland, Robert Pace, Richard Pearson, William Prentice, Nancy Schlossberg, John Shirley, and Patrick Suppes as members, deserve as much credit as I do for the Report. The Report is in effect neither the work nor idea of any one of us. Instead it is that consensus resident among us which Sam McCandless, the able Staff Director of the Commission, was able to discern and to publish as ours. This consensus is published in the general volume of the Commission under the title, *Righting the Balance*, the inspiration of Sam McCandless and of Marcia Van Meter of the Board, the latter of whom edited the Reports of the Commission. The individually conceived recommendations of the Commission are recorded in the second and companion volume of the Commission's Report under the less imaginative title, *Briefs*.

In working, the Commission went through a stage when my estimate of my understanding of our agreements exceeded the acceptance which several of my colleagues later accorded that estimate and an original draft of the Commission's Report therefore had to be aborted. The suggestion that we next encourage individual members to make their own action recommendations and then discuss and vote on each in its turn therefore became our consensus resolving procedure. That consensus-resolving procedure gave rise to the *Briefs* which the Board was kind enough to publish in order to let others know of the full dimensions of thought and acceptance in which the Commission's general Report is grounded. Those of you interested enough to read both Reports will find that the general one stems from the *Briefs* but that the general Report has an existence of its own as well. That existence was created by the tact, inspiration, and creativity of McCandless with unanimous encouragement of the Commission and with the Commission's full concurrence with his product. The Commission continually extended to each member the invitation to disagree with any recommendation or reason in the general Report. The fact that the general Report *is* devoid of any such disagreement therefore indicates that it is an expression of condition, need, and recommended action to which *each* of us agrees although probably everyone of us in the Commission would have written our general Report differently had we been McCandless. The identity of author beat savagely in the breast of every member of the Commission on Tests!

## The Board and Its Test Commission

I trust I may be forgiven a final digression of talking about people and procedure before actually discussing the Commission's Report itself. The digression is needed to show you how the Commission on Tests fits into the Board's structure.

The Commission on Tests was a special Commission of the College Board. Former Acting President of the Board, George Hanford, makes this distinction succinctly in the foreword of our Report as follows:

> *"The College Board as an association of schools and colleges, provides a forum for the debate of educational policies and practices, and had in the past exercised this forum function in part through the appointment of distinguished commissions to focus attention on important issues. The reports published by the Board of the Commission on Mathematics and of the Commission on English, for instance, will be familiar to readers interested in those fields. These commissions, however, addressed themselves to issues and problems that in the last analysis had to be solved by schools and colleges as schools and colleges. The Commission on Tests, by contrast, was to be asked to address itself to issues and problems surrounding the work of the College Board itself, to issues and problems that could be solved only by corporate action, only by schools and colleges acting in association as members of the Board. . . ."* (Report, pp. xiv-xv).

Hanford's words explain why I am here. The representatives of the schools and colleges with which many of you in this audience are affiliated will, in the near future, have to vote *as an association* on whatever of our report and its single recommendation the Officers and Trustees of the Board decide to move into the next Annual Meeting of the Board. Since this is the case, I welcome the opportunity to acquaint many of you more fully with the content and arguments of our Report and would like the opportunity in turn to stand for your questions in effort to see if I can to your satisfaction meet your objections, if any. The only recommendation of our Commission is that the Board in the future embrace applicants to all continuing education as a clientele, not as customers. I shall later go into the meaning of this recommendation more fully. At the moment, I content myself with its statement in effort to focus attention upon it because it essentially implies that at least the *interests* of students, if not students themselves, ought to be among the members of the Board deliberating on the transition of applicants to continuing education. Whether or not you have the good sense in common cause to let your College Board do just that will in my judgment, in the not too distant future, determine whether the College Board

(Continued on page 3)

(Continued from page 2)

remains strong in our society or becomes clearly identified as the agency of those seeking to sift applicants to their own institutions, not to promote education as a positive force in the growth of an individual whenever those growth forces quicken and demand expression.

## The Commission's Work and Conclusions

So much for the Commission's setting then. What gives with its actual Report?

McCandless admirably summarized the Commission's work as follows:

> *"The Commission on Tests was charged with undertaking a thorough and critical review of the College Entrance Examination Board's testing functions in American education, with considering possibilities for fundamental changes in the present tests and their use, and with making recommendations based on its conclusions.*
>
> *"After reviewing criticisms of current tests and their use, the Commission was convinced that the College Board should continue, rather than abandon, its testing functions in American education. The Commission concluded, however, that the Board's current tests and associated services are in need of considerable modification and improvement if they are to support equitably and efficiently access to America's emerging system of mass postsecondary education.*
>
> *"The Commission also concluded that the College Board's tests and associated services — although both would need adjustment and augmentation to hew closer to the public interest in doing so — could and should serve three functions in American education:*
>
> *1. A "distributive" function by contributing to comprehensive and sensitive descriptions of students, of colleges and their programs, and of the potential relationships between the two as both students and colleges engage in a process of reciprocal choice.*
>
> *2. A "credentialing" function by certifying demonstrable educational attainment whether acquired by attendance in school or college or not.*
>
> *3. An "educative" function by instructing students both in subject-matter areas and in the skills and methods of making decisions and choosing.*
>
> *"The Commission recommended that the schools and colleges that in association are the College Entrance Examination Board cause the Board to adopt the full range of potential entrants to programs offering opportunities for postsecondary education as a clientele that is as valued as the Board's institutional clientele and thus is due as large a share of service."* (Report, pp. 109-110).

You may find it surprising, perhaps even disappointing that a group of 21 allegedly distinguished persons would labor for four years with the full resources and support of the Board and come up with but a single—and with but such a presumably *simple*—recommendation. But listen just once again to the statement of that recommendation and this time let it run more fully through your mind so that you reach for its ends and thereby its full import. Here is the one and only *recommendation* of the Board's Commission on Tests:

> *"The Commission recommended that the schools and colleges that in association are the College Entrance Examination Board cause the Board to adopt the full range of potential entrants, to programs offering opportunities for postsecondary education, as a clientele that is as valued as the Board's institutional clientele and thus is due as large a share of service."*

Think on that recommendation just once more. Notice where it places *responsibility for action*—namely on you. The Commission hopes that "... the schools and colleges that in association are the College Entrance Examination Board cause the Board..." to do something. The Board *is* the schools and colleges which are its members. You representatives of schools and colleges which are the members of the Board have so far been causing the Board to do your bidding, namely to promulgate the feeling of openness and fairness in the transition from you Board member secondary schools to you Board member colleges. However, the now over 850 members of the Board which are its collegiate members do *not* embrace the full range of postsecondary institutions. Neither do the still smaller number and proportion of secondary schools which are its members constitute the full range of secondary schools. Finally, students are in no way members of the Board. The Commission therefore convinced itself, because of the personal experience of each of its members, the testimony of the witnesses whom it heard, and the papers which the Staff were good enough to have prepared, or to prepare for the Commission, that the Board needed to get itself caused to "... adopt the full range of potential entrants to programs offering opportunities for postsecondary education as a clientele that is as valued as the Board's institutional clientele." Notice that this part of our recommendation is truly double-barrelled. In expanding its clientele the Board will have markedly to expand its institutional membership to embrace all postsecondary institutions as well as some secondary institutions such as technical schools to which the Board presently does not attend in full measure. However, in adopting the "... full range of potential entrants..." as one of its future clienteles, the Board can never rest assured that it has fulfilled such an intention until it probably at last chooses some of its members solely on the basis of their potential entry, not their present status, a suggestion which the Commission actually made but about which we had considerable disagreement as you may imagine.

Too vague? Perhaps it may be for someone who has to reckon from day to day with more applicants than he has places to admit. But certainly the intention of the Commission will be clear to all, particularly when they read the Commission's concluding section on changing the governing structure of the Board. The Commission had no wish to presume on the prerogatives of the Board's Trustees and members and on the specific action recommendations which ordinarily flow with little or no acrimony from a fully functioning administration attuned to the intentions of its governing board and membership. We therefore elected the course which we did. We recognized that purpose and means would have to be formed by Trustees in association with Board membership and that only here was the College Entrance Examination Board able to change itself *as an association*. We therefore aim our recommendation directly at the schools and colleges which are in association the College Board and try, through our Report, to challenge these members to see the need and possibility inherent in causing their organization:

1) to change potential entrants from the status of customers to the status of a clientele;
2) to expand Board membership so that the institutions involved with the preparation and further education of such potential applicants were represented in the Board as were the potential applicants themselves; and

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued from page 3)

3) to *equalize* its service to potential applicants at a level with its presently high quality and extensive service to its institutional members.

Why did we reason as we did? What implementative suggestions did we generate in order to help Trustees intent on realizing our recommendation conceive and reason with means compatible with that recommendation? Let's examine both of these questions in their turn.

## An Asymmetric Size Relationship and Its Redress

First, why did we reason as we did?

In establishing the Commission, President Pearson and his Trustees charged us as follows:

> *"The Commission is asked to describe a comprehensible set of testing activities supporting open access to higher education under conditions which, as stated earlier, 80 percent of high school graduates and 70 percent of 18-year olds, together with significant numbers of adults, will make up the college-bound population. The exact figures may be debatable, and the time at which this level will be reached may be even more so. The important point is that our reference is to mass higher education and to the full range of people making up the potential postsecondary population."* (Report, p. 2)

Thus the Commission was from the outset oriented to consider the problem of transition from secondary to postsecondary education in its entirety, not from the Board's present position in that transition which is restricted to higher education defined as merely collegiate in nature and to secondary education defined as preparatory thereto. This wide-ranging and public-spirited charge thus gave the Commission vision and latitude from its very inception. We therefore presumed: 1) that the Officers and Trustees were ready to help restructure the Board; and 2) that they merely wished help in conceiving why this was necessary and how it might be brought about.

The Trustees charge to their Commission thus infused it with the necessity for expanding Board interests. However, it remained for James Coleman to formulate "Principle of Symmetry in College Choice," (*Briefs*, pp. 19-32) a principle which became the least common denominator of the Commission's consensus.

Coleman called upon his orientation as a sociologist in noting the marked asymmetry in size between our large organizations and their individual customers as they now relate to each other. He next focused upon the resources available to either party in this asymmetric size relationship. Finally, he noted that this relationship exists throughout our society, particularly in a man's employment by a large firm, in his purchasing from large producers or retailers, in his dealings with government, and, to our particular point, in a student's relation to his college or university.

Coleman then went on to argue that:

> *". . . the size asymmetry between the individual applicant and the college manifests itself principally in an asymmetry of information available to the applicant and the college, information upon which each makes its choice. The college demands and gets specific comparable information from and about applicants: high school grades, the information it requests in its admissions application form, and often most important of all, scores on the College Board's Scholastic Aptitude Test and Achievement Tests, or comparable tests from another agency. The applicant has only hearsay, rumors, and whatever information the college chooses to exhibit in its catalog as the basis for his selection of college and program of study. If he is fortunate, he has a friend attending a college, or he may visit the college and talk to a few students there and thus feel that he knows something of the atmosphere. The high frequency of college choices made on the basis of such insubstantial and unrepresentative experiences, as shown in the few studies made on college choice, is evidence of the absence of systematic means by which applicants can assess a college."* (*Briefs*, pp. 20-21).

## Righting the Balance Through the Board and Its Testing Functions

The single recommendation of the Board's Commission on Tests invites you through *your* association, which is the Board, to right this imbalance in information and service now available to individual students in their present relationships with postsecondary institutions. But how? How through specific materials, services, and programs, that is?

James Coleman's ideas not only offered structure for the only recommendation of the Board's Commission on Tests, it also gave rise to the Commission's espousal of a number of suggestions by Robert Pace about what the Board might assemble for students in testing *colleges* for them as well.

I spare you the detail of Pace's suggestions since many of them are probably already known to this audience who know his work on college and university environments as seen through students' reports. However, I do want in passing to note that the Report attends to the *programs* of the Board as well as to its tests. I do so in order to start consideration of another important line of attack in our Report and to note that the Commission was as interested in the *context* of tests and their use as in tests themselves.

A Commission on Tests established and supported by the College Board to recommend to its Trustees is understood by all to bear both upon the Board and upon tests. Furthermore, such a Commission is understood by all to be impertinent if it puts either or both of these premises to test during its own deliberations. I'm certain that you read into the Commission's *recommendation* that the Commission on Tests was impertinent enough to question whether the Board ought to exist or not. The Commission concluded that the Board should exist but as a different organization, in fact as a different organization which depended on its present members' capacity both to wish it to be so and to make it so. In point of fact, Commission members made no bones about suggesting definite alternatives which the College Board ought to consider for its new name as it changed its structure. One suggestion was made by John Hersey and stemmed from his greatly appreciated effort to make the *system* of information exchange needed by both parties in satisfying transition from secondary to continuing education more explicit. Hersey suggested that in this event the Board might decide to call itself the "College Entrance Service." A second alternative was offered by John Hoy and Nancy Schlossberg in their effort to have the Board embrace

(Continued on page 5)

(Continued from page 4)

not just the services of a College Entrance Service, which Hersey and I had placed under consideration by the Commission, but also to engage in very positive effort to further democratize our land by making continuing education a universal good offered universally and actively aided by relevant parties, structures, and systems. They suggested that in this event the Board might be renamed a "Continuing Education Entrance Board." Finally, the Board was offered its third alternative for expansion and changed identity by Sidney Marland who pressed for the Board's participation in a job-entry testing system managed with the same quality and acumen as is the Board's college entry system but for a new segment of the postsecondary institutions in America. In such event, the Board might consider changing its name to the "Career Entry Examination Board."

I trust you understand that there are more than scholars at play with names in the three new Board names which I have just sketched. The consensus of the Commission is that the structure of the Board must change if the Board is itself to remain a living and strong force in the proactive growth processes inherent in periodically aroused aspirations and pursuits of new purpose by each U.S. citizen. The just enumerated sequence of suggested new names for a restructured Board then merely constitutes layers of the onion which the Board might aggregate in that change as it moved its primary emphasis from just testing at initial entrance to postsecondary education to the service of multiple, rather than mere single, transitions from prior experience to currently desired educational enhancement of personal purpose, and finally on to realization of desired ends in work after any recent educational enhancement of self. The Commission on Tests thereby offers the College Board, and you as its members and/or clientele, the remarkable opportunity during the 1970's of forging a *real* illustration of what the United States repeatedly fumbles to invent but fails to recognize in that struggle, namely an institution which is *itself* identified squarely with redressing the balance of power for the individual by supplying proadaptive service to his strongest growth forces, namely those forces of aspiration which from time to time well in the breast of each of us as the "now" becomes boring and/or intolerable and the "then" enters our desires and gets focused for effective pursuit.

The above small side excursion into the Board's possible layer-like accretion of new purposes in the future interrupted my presentation of the Commission's dual questioning of any further need 1) for the Board itself or 2) for testing by the Board as means of fulfilling its needs. I made that excursion so that I might expand on the extensiveness of the Commission's consideration of new purposes and possible structures for the tried and true College Board of the first part of this century. I now in turn shall expand on the statement in the Commission's summary to the effect that the Board *should* continue to engage in testing but should markedly change its tests and their supporting programs. Here I want first to offer personal testimony in support of that recommendation. I then want to go forward to indicate some of the changes in tests and programs which the Commission suggested and to indicate my understanding of why we feel that those changes are necessary.

As I indicated in my early overall summary the Commission *did* conclude that Board tests were necessary. What I have not previously indicated is that, to my surprise knowing the past work of some of my Commission colleagues, I was probably the most dubious member of the Commission on this score. Carrying that doubt in the chair of a Commission is of course a delicate problem for group progress and consensus. I at first thought that I *had* balanced my doubt and my group responsibility off sufficiently well but the fate of my first draft of the Commission's Report signalled otherwise. I therefore shifted my field so that I could serve group purpose. However, I do wish to note here my present full concurrence with the Commission position. My present concurrence, as well as the concurrence of all other members of the Commission, however, is predicated both on the fact that the Board in the past has started to consider its functions not alone in terms of its tests but in terms of its *programs* as well and upon our trust that the Board will accelerate, change, and greatly expand the variety of its programs in the future.

As you look at the Board in terms of the history of its testing which McCandless wrote for us, the original function of the Board's tests was to certify competence for college work in a time when there was little or no articulation of secondary school and college achievements and purposes in an open forum. It appears that the attractiveness of the colleges which threw their lot into accepting Board test forms of certification gradually created a condition in which college desires and intentions started to weigh too heavily on the uncoordinated interests of secondary schools themselves. The Board consequently reformed its testing procedures by introducing an aptitude test as the heart of its Admissions Testing Program and by offering an option to comprehensive achievement tests in the form of survey-like, multiple-choice achievement tests. The multiple-choice aptitude and achievement tests gradually won popularity because of the time of year at which they were offered in the Admissions Testing Program when, in our pre-World War II course of academic history, selective colleges were attempting to nationalize their student bodies. However, it is interesting to notice how the comprehensive achievement tests, although disappearing during World War II, were revived during the 1950's in the form of Advanced Placement Tests, a form in which they served to keep able students in secondary school when colleges were luring them with the possibility of collegiate entry without a full secondary school qualification. The placement tests gave students a choice of staying in secondary school and trying to accelerate their studies in college by means of test equivalency certification or sometimes leaving secondary school early for college work. This form of competency certification by test is one which the Commission, prompted by Edgar Friedenberg, urges the College Board to keep in the public domain. The Commission applauds efforts such as the Board's present College Level Examination Program which permits a student to qualify for college credit by examination. The Commission also concurs wholeheartedly with the American principle of accepting a man on what of that which is now needed he can *do*, not what his history of needed capacities has been. The Commission liked this principle so much in fact that it urged the Board to do whatever it could to extend it so that it exists in the full range of transitions from one educational level to another and even from educational levels to work if the Board were permitted to figure in such a scheme. This is the principle which we refer to as the "credentialing" function in the above summary of our Report.

Although the Commission generally found it easy to accept the idea that the Board gives tests for reason of providing an alternative to formal education in our country,

(Continued on page 6)

(Continued from page 5)

consensus achieved in Commission around the "educative" and "distributive" functions of testing emerged less easily and at cost of greater discussion and what might be riskily characterized as more "vernier" adjustments of our statements. Consensus did emerge however. How did it happen and what was it? It appeared to several members of the Commission that admission to selective colleges was about at its zenith at the present time. It also was apparent to many members of the Commission that seeing the transition from secondary to continuing education in its entirety rather than in its presently more restricted College Board form and range, required one to think in terms of breaking the monolithic status of a scholastic aptitude test. Members of the Commission therefore thought that the Board must in the future stress "educative" purposes in its examination programs. The Commission felt that this "educative" function could be realized in several ways, the first which I will note having only general rather than specific bearing on the matter, and the others which I will note having that more specific educative bearing.

One of the things which the Commission urges on the Board and our society is honoring the multifaceted nature of man. We urged the manifestation of this truth in the Board's programs by suggesting that the Scholastic Aptitude Test — which for all intents and purposes seems virtually *to define* the College Board in the public mind — to set into a much larger context than the Board has so far created for it. By this we meant that a first immediately available alternative to the Board was the reconstitution of the SAT according to the many good suggestions offered by John Carroll which would have the effect of recasting the SAT into a modularly constructed test which would break verbal aptitude down into its several component parts more than now happens in the SAT. By this we also meant that the Board should begin immediately on the construal and construction of a series of aptitude tests which would reflect a person's capacities and styles *of learning* following the several excellent suggestions which Edmund Gordon provided for the Commission. The Board's testing and description of one's cognitive *development* would, in the Commission's judgment, constitute a giant step in the direction of breaking the present seemingly monolithic definition of continuing education according to just *level* of so-called scholastic aptitude. However, the Commission also felt that a true manifestation of the pluralism of aptitudes resident in humans could only ultimately be accomplished by thinking in terms of different *kinds* of aptitudes as well as in terms of levels of a single aptitude as is now so generally our habit. This is why a majority of the Commission members found Sidney Marland's suggestion that the Board enter upon testing for job entry so attractive. Such an expansion of attention in the Board would move its at least overt singular interest in scholastic aptitude to a more general interest in effective human functioning and its support.

These three general ways for viewing and reacting to the multifaceted nature of man will of course prove educative only to the extent that they provide each applicant means for his bridging the gap between his private concerns and public knowledge as he forms and acts upon his intention to apply to one or another institution of postsecondary education. I shall, in a moment, speak of the so-called "distributive" function of testing which these suggestions were also intended to satisfy but even more specifically so in that function. At this time, I first need to say a few words about the more directly educative functions which the Commission suggested that the Board develop tests and programs to fulfill.

Several of the Commission's witnesses made the point that tests would in the future become less useful in selection for college as postsecondary education was more dominantly funded only publicly. Furthermore, the device of "open admissions" to college also came into being during the Commission's deliberations. For both of these reasons, and for several others as well, the Commission thought that the Board had best attend assiduously, in the near future, to the provision of tests for *placement* in postsecondary courses of instruction. The Commission recognizes that the older Advanced Placement Program of the Board serves this function as does its newer College Level Examination Program and its still somewhat experimental Comparative Placement and Guidance Program. These three Programs together with the five or fewer differentiated scoring and reporting systems suggested by Richard Pearson would give the Board a range of test variability stretching from the advanced level of a subject to some of its more rudimentary levels and to some non-college taught material as well. However, the Commission still feels that further testing to certify prerequisite knowledge is necessary. In a very real sense, "open" education pervades the Commission's Report as chimera, not actuality, but the specter was in the Commission and is among us even today. The Commission therefore urges upon the Board adoption of all feasible programs which will make a student's meeting with people and his environment contribute as much as possible to fanning the spark which is *his* serious attempt continually to lend meaning to his experience. The engendering of capacity for the faculty of an institution of higher education to recognize preparation and desire in terms which are suggestive in themselves of implementative ways for the institution to make its resources compellingly *educational* to an admitted applicant is a purpose which the Commission urges the Board to enlarge in its attention.

However, both more personally understood bases for the focus and clarification of one's desire for postsecondary education and more diverse and adequate means for an institution to consider and to form community with the preparation and desire of its students are still only implementative solutions to what in the final analysis can only be a personal matter — one's education of himself. Recognizing this fact, the Commission also recommended that the Board give serious consideration to making its tests educational by giving test candidates, *after taking a test,* the correct answers of the test and perhaps even explanation of why such answers are considered correct as well. This suggestion by B. Alden Thresher gained majority acceptance in the Commission but remained a suggestion where the Commission fully realized that it was putting the Board on its mettle to achieve if it were to implement the idea successfully. The Commission did not mind suggesting such a trial for the Board since at this juncture in history it is so important to the common good for a needed reconstruction of *confidence* in the validity and fairness of means we employ to select persons under conditions of competition.

(Continued on page 7)

(Continued from page 6)

There is in my judgment a great need at this moment for professors to realize that the confidence of those they would serve depends on the professor's capacity to meet students eyeball to eyeball and that this capacity must be portrayed by those persons who represent institutions during selective admissions as well as by the discretionary instruments which they employ in the processes of doing so. *Now* is not the time for the faint of heart to be educators. *Now* is not the time to think of doing things more rapidly and more easily. However, now *is* the time for doing things more *understandably*, more *openly*, and more *satisfyingly* to those influenced by discretionary decisions.

The third and final testing function recommended to the Board by its Test Commission is what we called a *"distributive"* function. The Commission was swayed by Coleman's argument that a proadaptive-like institution had to be formed which would redress the presently marked asymmetry in balance of information, rights, and responsibilities now existing between collegiate institutions and their applicants. The Commission finally framed its suggestions about forming such an institution both as a recommendation for the restructuring of the Board's organization and as a set of specific recommendations about the distributive function of testing which the Board should fulfill.

The previously stated set of three suggestions which would have the *general* effect of amplifying the Board's capacity to satisfy an educative function in its testing, will also help the Board satisfy what we called its "distributive" function of testing as well. These three suggestions included; 1) the reconstitution of the Scholastic Aptitude Test as a modularly constructed and used test which breaks verbal aptitude down into several more of its component parts than it now does; 2) the construal and construction of a new set of tests which would represent a person's capacities and styles of actual *learning;* and 3) the undertaking of the planning and use of a series of tests designed for *job* entry. The Commission felt that, in probably thereby dwarfing the present monolith of scholastic aptitude, these suggestions would have the desired effect of giving applicants the feeling that their identity as a young adult was occurring in a society containing more opportunity than now seemed to be understood by young adults.

The provision of more pathways to personal satisfaction as suggested above would be necessary but not sufficient for the more vital feeling of "distribution" which the Commission urged the Board to engender through its tests and programs. A second necessary condition is *information* relevant to the choice to be made. The Commission commended the Board on its existing provision both of a Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test and of a *College Handbook* which was recently modified to incorporate the former *Manual of Freshman Class Profiles,* and for its recent start of an Experimental Guidance Information System. However, the Commission still felt that these procedures were heavily weighted by what the *colleges* wanted to provide and insufficiently represented what a *student* really needed in choosing a college to which he would apply. The Commission therefore suggested as I have said before that the Board *test colleges* for students using a system devised by Pace and his colleagues and construct what Pearson thought would only need to be a small set of reporting systems which, with the advice and aid of applicants to postsecondary education, would continue the process of refining support for a student's *choice* of an institution of postsecondary education, not just an institution's *selection* of a set of students from a larger set of applicants.

But the provision of diverse pathways and of information which will enlighten the choice of the student, not just the decision of an institution, again is not enough for the essence of a student's participation and satisfaction with his postsecondary educational experiences. To this end, the Commission additionally suggested that the Board become a College Entrance Service. The idea of the entrance service is to create a *system* which would be more likely than now to have the effect of helping students construe their choice of postsecondary education as a decision in the context of a personal style of living. The Commission was in general accord with the need for such a system which would include the elements of more pluralistic aptitude testing, information more relevant for college choice, and of advocacy and counseling in proadaptive institutions available to aspirants where they live. However, it remained for John Hersey to frame as follows what is to me the gracefully stated reason for these suggestions:

> *"It should be possible to devise and exchange in which both the inputs and outputs [are] nearly balanced and more explicitly useful in the process of choice. . . . The reciprocal goals of the partners in this exchange would be for the student to find the handful of colleges, and eventually the one college, that would most nearly fit his needs and desires and talents, and for the college to find the students who, along with its faculty, would enable it to become a community manifesting its own best possibilities."* (*Briefs,* p. 51).

As the College Board creates the tests and other materials which — together with the people who must direct and be influenced by their existence — would form a system facilitating both individual choice of college and collegiate creation of a community manifesting its own best possibilities, it may well find that the *interactive* power of the computer in the filing and retrieval of information under control of the party influenced by the interactively created data will become absolutely essential to the Board's operation. The Commission therefore seconded me in recommending that the Board keep this possibility under active exploration and that it do what it can afford to do to help this kind of potential to form as a public utility in the future. As the Board does this it will in effect be constructing the so-called Admissions Machine which I used in the argument of my Brief, "Can a Machine Admit an Applicant to Continuing Education?" (*Briefs,* pp. 161-186). In writing its *Righting the Balance*, the Commission did a much more expanded, explicit, and clearer job than I did in my Brief of designing the needed content and structure for my so-called Admissions Machine. However, I still hold that there is a chestnut squirreled away in my Brief to which the Commission did not react but might have to the Report's benefit, namely to the possibility within the structure of my query itself for restructuring the theory of tests based upon a sequential sharing by two parties in decision-making which must terminate upon admissions action by the admissions officer to which the applicant ultimately applies "on computer line."

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from page 7)

## Righting the Balance Through Your Rethinking-Based Action

In final summary now, the Commission's one-page capsule of *Righting the Balance* remains my best way of moving to conclusion:

"CHARGED WITH

- reviewing the College Board's testing functions in American education
- considering possibilities for fundamental changes in tests and their use (and)
- making recommendations based on its conclusions

THE COMMISSION ON TESTS

- was convinced that the College Board should modify and improve rather than abandon, its tests and associated services in seeking to serve (a 'distributive,' a 'credentialing,' and an 'educative' function)
- generated suggestions about the implications in a system of mass postsecondary education, of the Board's acting both for its traditional institutional clientele and for an equally valued student clientele (and)
- recommended that the College Board adopt the full range of potential entrants into programs of postsecondary education as a clientele that is as valued as the Board's institutional clientele and thus is due as large a share of service." (*Report*, p. vii.)

Will the work of the Commission bear fruit for the young adults of our nation as they engage in the transitions from what they now do to study in institutions of postsecondary education? Whether the suggestions of the Commission *do* or not remains to be seen. At the present time whether they *can* or not hangs in the balance. The Commission reported to the Annual Meeting of the College Entrance Examination Board only about one month ago. The Commission has since been discharged by the Board, as expected, because our *ad hoc* assignment is fulfilled. Therefore it now remains up to the Trustees of the Board and the representatives of secondary schools and colleges, such as those for which you work, to determine in what the Commission hopes will be the near future whether our recommendation will be taken or not. I sincerely hope that it will, since I fully believe that you, acting as the institution which *is* the College Board, must democratize your structure and programs in order to meet the proadaptive needs of our country in the numerous and multifaceted transitions to postsecondary education which will occur during the 1970's. However, even if you don't adopt our recommendation itself, there are many suggestions in our Report which if themselves adopted would alleviate some of the current stresses and strains in the college admissions process. I sincerely hope that they will be so alleviated. But it depends on *you*.

The theme of your Conference has been "Rethinking School and College Relations." I have spoken to you of tests in relation to the transition of applicants from the one of you to the other of you in the midst of your so-called relations. Please rethink the role of tests in your relationships. Our society needs such rethinking. More importantly still, you colleges in New England need such rethinking in your *own* self interest. What will be the role of the private college and university in the region and the country in the future as the private college and university begin to take second place in size of enrolled student bodies to public institutions of higher education? Can you maintain your prestige and attraction as you lose size domination of your class? *There* is an interesting question which ought to make you a lot more interested than I may so far have done in rethinking, reconstituting, and instituting systems more like the eyeball-to-eyeball relationship which private institutions will in the future need to maintain between students and professors as they forge a community of students and faculty able to use the resources of a postsecondary institution for personal and common goods.

* * * * * * * *

## REFERENCES

Commission on Tests (1970). **Report of the Commission on Tests: I Righting the Balance.** Princeton, N. J.: The College Entrance Examination Board, Publications Office, P. O. Box 592.

Commission on Tests (1970). **Report of the Commission on Tests: II Briefs.** Princeton, N. J.: The College Entrance Examination Board, Publications Office, P. O. Box 592.

New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. **The Program of the 85th Annual Meeting.** Boston, Mass.: The Association.

This **Bulletin** was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

### PROJECT SURVEY — INFORMATION NEEDED

The ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged is planning to update its records on programs for children and youth from underprivileged environments. Two documents will result from this study, an ERIC-IRCD BULLETIN presenting in-depth observations of selected projects and a more extensive report on the state of compensatory education in the United States with data presented on all in-school elementary and secondary programs we can contact. Your assistance is needed to identify the most productive programs, techniques and materials.

There are two ways in which the effectiveness of a program might be measured. One is on the basis of the perceptions that a community has of the effectiveness of such a program. The second is on the basis of objective evaluation of academic achievement and personal development. Would you please identify on the basis of these two criteria the most effective education programs for disadvantaged children or youth about which you are aware either by formal report or personal observation. Would you please give us the name of the contact person, the title and address of the program and a brief statement on why you selected it.

Forward to: Dr. Edmund W. Gordon
Dr. Adelaide Jablonsky
Box 40, Teachers College
New York, N. Y. 10027

(Continued from page 1)

Recommendations that individual members of the Commission on Tests proposed that the Commission make to the College Entrance Examination Board, and that the Commission forwarded to the Board as suggestions for its consideration are contained in the following list. Arguments for these proposals advanced by individual members as well as the reactions of other members to them are given in detail in *Briefs*, the second volume of this report.

It is recommended that the College Entrance Examination Board:

1.1 Propose to an organization such as the American Council on Education that it create a Council on College Admissions and Scholarship Testing that would invite the various testing organizations and agencies to join for the purpose of cooperating in research that would lead to mutual agreements among themselves and the higher-education institutions concerned, whereby colleges would accept scores on different tests as equivalent for admissions purposes.

1.2 Propose that the research and development to be sponsored by this council be based on a method of establishing equivalencies in terms of equivalent predictions of criterion variables.

(Proposed by John B. Carroll in his brief "Redundant Testing.")

2.1 Support research to investigate the feasibility of recasting the SAT along the following lines:

a. Provision of a section or sections more clearly emphasizing developed verbal skills relating to language comprehension and learning from language, with the reasoning component de-emphasized;

b. Provision of a section or sections more clearly emphasizing ability in reasoning and inference that does not depend greatly on verbal skills;

c. De-emphasis of the quantitative sections of the tests, with provisions for testing of developed ability in this area in specific achievement tests apart from the SAT;

d. Administration of some parts of the SAT in an auditory mode, to reduce dependence of those parts on reading ability;

e. Provision of a section or sections that would measure scholastic learning capacities or potentials as much as possible apart from developed abilities;

f. Validation of SAT materials not only against overall absolute success in higher education (in various types of programs), but also against gains made in developed abilities.

2.2 Introduce on a gradual basis, if the above types of tests prove feasible and acceptable, a new and possibly renamed SAT, with appropriate dissemination of information about the test both to educational institutions and to candidate populations.

(Proposed by John B. Carroll in his brief "Possible Directions in Which College Entrance Examination Board Tests of Abilities and Learning Capacities Might Be Developed.")

3.1 Systematically gather and publish relevant information about colleges, the nature of that information to be determined by a working group including representatives of colleges, students, and high schools.

3.2 Beyond the standardized testing that allows colleges to make direct comparisons of a few characteristics of applicants, provide the applicant with the opportunity, through selection from a very wide variety of special tests ranging in subjects from numismatics to algebraic topology, to exhibit his special capabilities, developed in or out of high school, that may be relevant to the colleges' interest in him.

3.3 Provide colleges and applicants with information about the other only if they are willing to allow information about themselves to be made available.

3.4 Modify its governing structure to embody a symmetry of college and applicant interests.

(Proposed by James S. Coleman in his brief "The Principle of Symmetry in College Choice.")

4.1 Offer not merely achievement and aptitude tests but also diagnostic tests that would permit colleges and students to select each other with due regard to prospective compatability.

4.2 Offer high school juniors and seniors, or college students intent on transfer or graduate study, the opportunity to take tests for the purpose of obtaining scores, interpretable by reference to national norms in lieu of grades and, if legally possible, in lieu of school attendance.

(Proposed by Edgar Z. Friedenberg in his brief "Can Testing Contribute to the Quest for Community Among Students?")

5.1 Explore possibilities for adding to its qauntitative reports on the performance of students, reports descriptive of the patterns of achievement and function derived from the qualitative analysis of existing tests.

5.2 Explore the development of test items and procedures that lend themselves to descriptive and qualitative analysis of cognitive and affective adaptive functions, in addition to wider specific achievements.

5.3 Explore the development of report procedures that convey the qualitative richness of these new tests and procedures to students and institutions in ways that encourage individualized prescriptive educational planning.

5.4 Explore the development of research that will add to understanding of the ways in which more traditional patterns of instruction will need to be modified to make appropriate use of wider ranges and varieties of human talent and adaptation in continuing education.

(Proposed by Edmund W. Gordon in his brief "Toward a Qualitative Approach to Assessment.")

6.1 Carry the principle of symmetry to its full realization by establishing as soon as possible a College Entrance Service, the purpose of which would be:

a. to guide applying students to colleges that would fit their needs and abilities;

b. to assist institutions in building student populations that, along with their faculties, would enable them to become communities manifesting their own best possibilities;

c. to supply diagnostic and guidance materials on themselves to individual students;

d. to supply evaluative materials on themselves to colleges.

6.2 To this end to undertake simultaneously both operations and research, using both printed and computerized techniques.

(Proposed by John Hersey in his brief "A College Entrance Service.")

7.1 Increase minority-group representation on the College Board staff to a level that more fully reflects the society at large and the commitments already shown by member institutions.

7.2 Change the composition of committee membership to reflect the same pattern.

7.3 Seek to shift the membership of the Board of Trustees in a similar direction.

(Continued on page 10)

(Continued from page 9)

7.4 Review its present financial commitments and completely analyze available supplementary funds in the area of equal educational opportunity programs, with a view toward a dramatic extension of activity.

(Proposed by John C. Hoy in his brief "Educational Civil Rights and the College Board.")

8.1 Take steps to increase greatly the scope of its testing program to include the measurement of student competencies other than those reflected in measures of academic promise for college entrance.

8.2 Undertake initially a major study, including a pilot program to develop appropriate materials and procedures, of the feasibility of assessing qualifications and classifications for job entry and for postsecondary technical training.

8.3 If the results of the study and the experience with the pilot program are promising, consider expanding its function to serve all high school graduates, including those entering the work force directly as well as those planning to go to college, and changing its name accordingly to "Career Entry Examination Program," or such other appropriate name as would accurately reflect its expanded clientele.

(Proposed by Sidney P. Marland in his brief "A Proposal for a Comprehensive System of Testing for Job Entry.")

9.1 Support a research and development program to assemble, evaluate, and interpret information about colleges, taking into account the kinds of issues, sources, and technical matters described in this brief.

9.2 Regard this program as contributing, in stages, to the necessary software underlying a computerized information system.

9.3 Present information developed from the program in some printed form to be determined by the College Board, pending its incorporation into a computerized system, so that as much as possible will be available to applicants at the earliest feasible time.

(Proposed by Robert Pace in his brief "A Program for Providing Information about Colleges to Applicants.")

10.1 Adopt as its principal policy objectives in testing the provision of a broad array of tests and other information designed to assist tenth- and eleventh-grade high school students in educational planning and decisions with respect to post-high school opportunities.

10.2 Provide factual and scientifically based information about individual colleges and universities for use by prospective applicants. This information should go beyond that now routinely supplied by institutions of higher education and should include ability and performance expectations for admission and for success in particular programs as well as information about the campus environment.

10.3 Make provisions for a series of three to five specialized reporting programs, corresponding to different types of institutions of higher education, for the provision of test results to colleges and universities in connection with institutional decisions about admissions and placement. Further, experimentation should be undertaken with respect to computer storage and retrieval of this information so that it can be made available to the institutions at the time and in the form needed for decisions. Further, standards for protecting the privacy of students should be established so that any test information necessary for students but not appropriate for use in institutional decisions will be reported only to students.

10.4 Be prepared to offer supplementary testing programs for particular groups of colleges and universities and for prospective applicants who may not be enrolled in high school under provisions that would limit redundancy and duplication with the basic program.

10.5 Keep the objectives proposed in this report under continuing policy review and provide adequate empirical research in continuing review in order to assess the extent and timing of the proposed changes.

(Proposed by Richard Pearson in his brief "Education and Testing in a Period of Qualitative Change.")

11.1 Establish regional centers for guidance in continuing education.

11.2 Consider as potential programs for these centers:

a. Offering appraisal and advisement services;
b. Developing a system of credit equivalency;
c. Offering courses in guidance for credit;
d. Using new training methods for staff development;
e. Conducting experimentation and research.

11.3 Incorporate student participation into the regional centers and into the Board's national program.

11.4 Change its name and function to "Continuing Education Entrance Board."

(Proposed by Nancy K. Schlossberg, John C. Hoy, and Edmund W. Gordon in their brief "Regional Centers for Guidance in Continuing Education.")

12.1 Supplement its present programs with self-administered and self-scored tests, made available to students in great profusion, and accompanied, under various degrees of delayed availability, by reasoned discussions about the choice of an answer for each item.

12.2 Draw teachers, particularly those in secondary schools, into large-scale participation in the production both of these tests, and of tests in the conventional "adversary" mode.

12.3 Stress face or curricular validity in the selection of test items, stress items of teaching merit.

12.4 Invite, experimentally at least, groups of students who have taken a test soon thereafter to participate in an oral discussion of the test under the Board's auspices.

(Proposed by B. Alden Thresher in his brief "A Proposal for Self-Scored, Self-Administered Tests.")

13.1 Experiment actively with a system of modular, diagnostic instruments designed to test important competencies; these would, in principle, resemble the present Achievement Tests.

13.2 Make these available to colleges as a means of permitting greater flexibility in the choice of combinations of tests selected by the student, and required or permitted by the college.

13.3 Continue the Scholastic Aptitude Test for the time being, with such improvements as may be possible.

13.4 Encourage member colleges gradually to replace the Scholastic Aptitude Test with its fixed, predetermined parts or modules, by more flexible assortments of modular tests.

13.5 Reduce the speededness of its tests by reducing the number of items per test, even at the cost of some loss of reliability.

(Proposed by B. Alden Thresher in his brief "Diversification in Educational Assessment.")

14.1 Establish a small study group that will outline an admissions machine and undertake feasibility studies needed to reach within two years:

a. A better-grounded decision on the further possibility

(Continued on page 11)

(Continued from page 10)

of developing an admissions machine; and,

b. If then still considered possible, a more detailed financial and structural plan for implementing what appear to be better lines of its development.

14.2 In appointing this study group, recognize that its report within two years will bear serious financial implications for the Board.

(Proposed by David V. Tiedeman in his brief "Can a Machine Admit an Applicant to Continuing Education?")

## PLEASE NOTE

**There has been a retroactive price change for ERIC documents. All documents cited in the ERIC system in the past as well as those which will be cited in the future are governed by the new pricing. A change in the ERIC Document Reproduction Service address also has been made for all ERIC document reproduction orders.**

Effective immediately, orders for reproductions of all documents which have been assigned ED numbers must be sent to:

ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS)
Leasco Information Products, Inc.
4827 Rugby Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

All orders must be in writing, stating the ED numbers of the desired documents, the number of copies wanted and the type of reproduction desired—microfiche (MF) or hard copy (HC). Microfiche is a 4x6 inch sheet of film requiring special readers to magnify the print. Hard copy is a paper photo copy or facsimile of the original document. Each microfiche copy of a document costs $0.65. The hard copy price is determined by the number of pages the document contains. The schedule is as follows:

| *No. of pages* | *Price* |
|---|---|
| 1–100 | $ 3.29 |
| 101–200 | 6.58 |
| 201–300 | 9.87 |
| 301–400 | 13.16 |
| 401–500 | 16.45 |
| Each additional 1–100 page increment | 3.29 |

Payment must accompany orders totaling less than $10.00. There is no handling charge. Book rate or library rate postage is included in the above prices. The difference between book rate or library rate and first class, if requested, or foreign postage (outside the continental United States) will be billed at cost.

## NEW PRICE SCHEDULE
## CURRENT INDEX TO JOURNALS IN EDUCATION

Since January 1, 1971, the following price schedule has been in effect for CIJE:

Monthly (12 issues) .....$39.00
Semiannual and Annual .....$40.00
Monthly, Semiannual & Annual.....$74.00
Annual (purchased singly) .....$29.00
Single monthly copies continue to be ....$ 3.50 each

CIJE is a monthly cataloging and indexing publication for journal and periodical literature in the field of education. It is available from:

CCM Information Corporation
(A subsidiary of Crowell Collier and Macmillan, Inc.)
909 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022.

## ERIC PUBLICATIONS

| | GPO Order Number | Price |
|---|---|---|
| **Research in Education** Monthly Abstract Journal. Please send subscription orders separately from orders for other publications listed below. | Yearly Subscription<br>Domestic<br>Foreign<br>Single Issues | <br>$21.00<br>$26.25<br>$ 1.75 |
| **Research in Education, 1967 Annual Index Reports** | (Order by title) | $ 3.25 |
| **Research in Education, 1967 Annual Index Projects** Cumulative Indexes of first 14 issues of RIE November 1966-December 1967, 2,349 titles | (Order by title) | $ 1.50 |
| **Research in Education, Annual Index Reports** January-December 1968, 8,803 titles | (Order by title) | $ 8.25 |
| **Research in Education, Annual Index Reports** January-December 1969, 10,453 titles | (Order by title) | $ 6.25 |
| **Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors, Second Edition** To be used in searching the subject indexes of RIE and other ERIC publications. | OE–12031–69 | $ 3.25 |
| **Rules for Thesaurus Preparation, Sept. 1969** | OE-1204 | $ 0.20 |
| **Office of Education Research Reports, 1956-65, Resumes** Abstracts of 1,214 research reports received by the Bureau of Research before the start of publication of RIE. | OE-12029 | $ 1.75 |
| **Office of Education Research Reports, 1956-65, Indexes** Indexes, reports by author, institution subject, and report numbers. | OE-12028 | $ 2.00 |
| **ERIC Catalog of Selected Documents on the Disadvantaged. Number and Author Index** 1,746 documents dealing with the special educational needs of disadvantaged, to 1966. | OE-37001 | $ 0.65 |
| **ERIC Catalog of Selected Documents, Subject Index,** to 1966. | OE–37002 | $ 3.00 |
| **Pacesetters in Innovation, Fiscal Year 1967** Résumés of projects to advance creativity in education approved during fiscal year 1967 indexed by subject, local education agency, and project number. 907 documents covered. | OE–20103–67 | $ 2.50 |
| **Pacesetters in Innovation, Fiscal Year 1968** | OE–20103–68 | $ 2.50 |
| **Pacesetters in Innovation, Fiscal Year 1969** | OE-20103–69 | $ 5.00 |
| **Manpower Research: Inventory for Fiscal Years 1966 and 1967** Collection by Intragency Committee on Manpower Research covering 392 documents. | OE–12036 | $ 2.75 |
| **Manpower Research: Inventory for Fiscal Year 1968** | OE–12036–68 | $ 1.75 |
| **Manpower Research: Inventory for Fiscal Year 1969** | OE-12036–69 | $ 1.75 |
| **Selected Documents in Higher Education, Number and Subject Index** Covers 845 documents. | Not available from GPO Order from EDRS/NCR ED 012 110 | $4.05 (HC) $ 0.50 (MF) |
| **How To Use ERIC** A graphic aid to the use of ERIC system. | OE 12037–B | —$ 0.25 |

Purchase from: Superintendent of Documents
U. S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D. C. 20402

## ERIC-IRCD PUBLICATIONS

Single copies of the following publications are available free of charge from ERIC-IRCD, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027.

### IRCD BULLETINS

Vol. V, No. 3. **Relevance and Pluralism in Curriculum Development,** Edmund W. Gordon, Adelaide Jablonsky, Lebert Bethune, Richard G. Hatcher, and Ossie Davis. 23p., Summer 1969.

Vol. V. No. 4. **Education, Ethnicity, Genetics and Intelligence,** Edmund W. Gordon, Carol Lopate, Jerry Hirsch, Benjamin S. Bloom, Allen C. Goldstein, and Howard E. Gruber. 24p., Fall 1969.

Vol. V, No. 5. **Higher Education and the Challenge of Universal Access to Post-Secondary Education,** Edmund W. Gordon; **Admission Procedures in Transition,** Hugh W. Lane; **Admissions Policy: Implications and Consequences,** Thomas C. Mendenhall; **The City College Dual Admissions Proposal . . . ,** Judith R. Ruchkin. 15p., Winter 1969.

Vol. VI, Nos. 1 & 2. **Media for Teaching Afro-American Studies,** Adelaide Jablonsky. 23p., Spring-Summer 1970.

Vol. VI, No. 3. **Bodies, Brains and Poverty: Poor Children and the Schools,** Joan Dye Gussow; **Recommendations for Child Health Care Spelled Out in Special Academy Report,** American Academy of Pediatrics, 20p., September 1970.

### THE STUDY OF COLLEGIATE COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS FOR MINORITY GROUP YOUTH

**The College Readiness Program: A Program for Third World Students at the College of San Mateo,** California, Carol Lopate. 36p., November 1969.

**A Selected ERIC Bibliography on Pre-College Preparation of Students from Disadvantaged Backgrounds,** Effie M. Bynum. 30p., May 1969.

**A Syllabus for the Study of Selective Writings by W. E. B. DuBois,** Walter Wilson. 47p., March 1970.

### URBAN DISADVANTAGED SERIES

No. 9 **The School Dropout: A Review of the ERIC Literature,** Adelaide Jablonsky. 42p., March 1970.

No. 10 **School Dropout Programs: A Review of the ERIC Literature,** Adelaide Jablonsky. 30p., March 1970.

No. 11 **The School Dropout and the World of Work: A Review of the ERIC Literature,** Adelaide Jablonsky. 27p., March 1970.

No. 12 **The Neighborhood Youth Corps: A Review of the ERIC Literature,** Adelaide Jablonsky and Regina Barnes. 23p., March 1970.

No. 13 **The Job Corps: A Review of the ERIC Literature,** Adelaide Jablonsky. 33p., March 1970.

No. 14 **ERIC-IRCD Resources on the School Dropout,** Adelaide Jablonsky. 27p., April 1970.

No. 15 **Guidance in an Urban Setting,** Edmund W. Gordon. 16p., June 1970.

No. 17 **Significant Trends in the Education of the Disadvantaged,** Edmund W. Gordon. 24p., August 1970.

No. 18 **Mutability of Intelligence and Epidemiology of Mild Mental Retardation,** Zena Stein and Mervyn Susser. 41p., September 1970. (Reprinted from **Review of Educational Research,** Vol. 40, No. 1, February 1970.)

No. 19 **Principal Sources for the Study of the Mutability of Intelligence and the Epidemiology of Mild Mental Retardation,** Ellen R. Goldstein. 71p., September 1970.

## INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER ON THE DISADVANTAGED

The IRCD BULLETIN, a publication of the ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged, is published five times a year and usually includes status or interpretive statements, book reviews, and a selected bibliography on the center's special areas. Persons may ask, in writing, to be placed on the subscription list. The center also publishes the ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series and the Collegiate Compensatory Education Series, a series of bibliographies, reviews, and position papers. Numbers in this series will be announced in the IRCD BULLETIN and can be obtained by request. Subject areas covered by IRCD include the effects of disadvantaged environments; the academic, intellectual, and social performance of disadvantaged youth; programs and practices which provide learning experiences to compensate for the special problems and build on the characteristics of the disadvantaged; programs related to economic and ethnic discrimination, segregation, desegregation, and integration in education; and materials related to ethnic studies.

The center is operated under a contract with the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) of the U.S. Office of Education and receives additional funds from the College Entrance Examination Board, Teachers College, Columbia University, the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities of the U.S. Office of Education, and other agencies for special services.

**Edmund W. Gordon**
*Director*

**Erwin Flaxman**
*Associate Director*

**ERIC-IRCD BULLETIN**
Edmund W. Gordon — Editor

Teachers College
Columbia University
525 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027

**Volume VI, No. 4**

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

☆ GPO 947-423

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
New York, N. Y.
Permit No. 5578